

PARADIGMS OF ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Sadiye KARAPELIT

sadiyekarapelit@gmail.com

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Azmiye YINAL

Akdeniz Karpaz University

azmiye.yinal@akun.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the paradigms adopted by school administrators and teachers in educational administration in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. In the quantitative study, the data obtained from 116 participants were collected through the Educational Paradigms Scale developed by Öztürk Erzincan (2012) and analyzed with SPSS program. The findings of the study show that there are significant differences in the types of paradigms adopted by the participants according to their demographic characteristics. In terms of the interpretivist paradigm, it was determined that teachers were more prone to this approach than administrators; Younger and less senior individuals adopted the interpretivist paradigm more. In terms of positivist paradigm, it was found that male participants, administrators, and individuals with older age and seniority were more inclined towards this approach. These results reveal that the paradigms adopted in educational administration differ according to variables such as age, position and experience and that these differences may have an impact on managerial approaches.

Keywords: Educational Administration, Paradigm, Positivist Paradigm, Interpretivist Paradigm.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Problem Status

Today, education systems are in a transformation process under the influence of rapidly changing social, cultural, economic and technological conditions. This transformation affects not only teaching methods but also perspectives on educational management. The paradigms adopted in educational management directly shape the decision-making styles, leadership approaches and school culture of school administrators and teachers (Biçici, 2018). However, positivist approaches based on traditional, centralized and hierarchical structures are insufficient to meet today's pluralistic, democratic and participatory education approaches (Firat, 2006; Güngör, 2004). In this context, educational administrators and teachers need to develop multi-faceted perspectives equipped with both positivist and interpretive or critical paradigms, not just a single paradigm (Wu & He, 2009).

Interpretive paradigms, in particular, offer a more flexible and participatory management approach by emphasizing the integration of individual differences, social contexts, and value systems into management processes (Güngör, 2004). However, research shows that the levels of paradigm adoption by administrators and teachers vary according to variables such as age, gender, level of education, and tenure, and that they often experience difficulties in adapting to this change process (Yıldız, 2004). Understanding the paradigm diversity in educational management is important in terms of revealing how administrators and teachers, who are the actors of this process, shape their management decisions. Therefore, examining how the paradigm approaches adopted in educational management are perceived by school administrators and teachers and which paradigms are more dominant constitutes an area worth investigating in terms of evaluating the extent to which management approaches coincide with current educational needs.

1.2 Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research is to examine the paradigms adopted by school administrators and teachers in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) in educational administration. Within the scope of the research, the participants were evaluated according to their demographic variables such as gender, age, type of duty and **professional** seniority. paradigm tendencies will be evaluated with descriptive and comparative analyses. In this direction, which paradigm is more dominant in educational administration and the effects of the variables in question on paradigm preference are revealed with statistical methods.

1.3 Importance of Research

structural and paradigmatic transformations experienced in education systems are also reshaping the approaches of administrators and teachers to educational management. In this context, developing awareness about the paradigms adopted in educational management is of great importance in terms of creating effective and contemporary management practices. This research aims to contribute to the management processes of institutions becoming more democratic, participatory and context-based by analyzing the paradigm tendencies of educational administrators and teachers. The findings obtained will provide important clues for the restructuring of future education policies and manager training programs.

1.4 Limitations

This research was conducted within certain limitations.

- The universe of the research is limited only to school administrators and teachers within the borders of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.
- The 116 participants constituting the sample group were determined by the stratified sampling method and the results are limited to this sample.
- Only the “Educational Paradigms Scale” developed by Öztürk Erzincan (2012) was used as the data collection tool.

1.5 Definitions

Paradigm: The basic intellectual framework that determines the production of knowledge, understanding of method and view of reality in a particular field. In educational administration, paradigm refers to the approaches of managers and teachers to educational processes (Öztürk Erzincan, 2012).

Positivist Paradigm: It is an approach based on the principles of objectivity, measurability , generalizability and causality, and adopts a more hierarchical and centralized management approach (Goksoy, 2019) .

Interpretive Paradigm: It is an approach that adopts a more participatory, flexible and people-oriented management approach based on understanding individuals by taking their values, beliefs and contexts into account (Güngör, 2004).

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Paradigm Concept

Paradigm is a concept that refers to the set of basic assumptions, theories, methods, and values shared by a specific scientific community (Gülpınar, 2021) . First defined systematically by philosopher of science Thomas S. Kuhn, paradigm provides a framework for how scientific activities will be carried out over a certain period. In this context, paradigm represents a generally accepted understanding of what a discipline investigates, how it investigates, and how it interprets the information obtained. Scientific developments usually occur by questioning the existing paradigm as a result of contradictions that arise over time and situations that it is inadequate to explain, and by adopting a new paradigm. The concept of paradigm is not limited to natural sciences alone, but also maintains its validity in various fields such as social sciences, education, economics, and politics; It is used as a basic framework in the analysis of knowledge production processes and intellectual transformations (Goksoy, 2019) .

Paradigm is a mental framework that scientific communities adopt for a certain period of time, determining how they will address and solve problems (Öztürk Erzincan, 2012). Over time, as new problems that cannot be solved within this framework or that do not comply with the existing paradigm emerge, the dominant paradigm begins to lose its power. However, this change is usually not sudden, but rather a slow and difficult-to-notice process (Yinal & Banje, 2023). The first signs of this process are the questioning of the paradigm, the increase in criticism, and the emergence of alternative approaches. These new approaches, which are initially seen as marginal, may eventually gain wider acceptance and replace the existing paradigm (Hammack, 2005) .

Thomas Kuhn (2000) argues that science is not a continuous and linear process of knowledge accumulation, but instead develops through periodic revolutions. Scientific revolutions occur when established beliefs are fundamentally questioned and may initially be rejected by the existing scientific community. However, such changes lead to the adoption of new norms, especially with the contributions of young scientists. For example, Galileo's heliocentric model of the universe encountered great resistance not only scientifically but also at the social and institutional level because it contradicted the dominant paradigms of the time. This example reveals that paradigm shifts have not only scientific but also ideological and structural dimensions (Öztürk Erzincan, 2012).

The modern paradigm, on the other hand, has been shaped by the ideas of thinkers such as Descartes, Newton and Bacon since the 17th century and has been transferred to the social sciences based on a positivist understanding. This approach argues that nature and society can be explained by universal and objective laws, and that these laws can be reached through reason and science (Özel, 2007) . However, the crises that the modern paradigm encountered in the field of natural sciences in the 20th century - especially with developments such as quantum physics, the theory of relativity and the uncertainty principle - have brought the absolute validity of this understanding into question. The Newtonian mechanical universe model is no longer sufficient to explain all phenomena, and the quantum paradigm offers a new intellectual ground. These developments reveal that science should be re-evaluated not only in technical but also in social and philosophical contexts (Kara, 2022) .

2.2. Basic paradigms

2.2.1. Positivist Paradigm/ Rational paradigm

The positivist paradigm was developed in the 19th century, inspired by the methods of natural sciences in particular, and argues that social phenomena can be examined with the same principles of objectivity and measurability (Topkaya, 2013) . This paradigm accepts the existence of universal and immutable laws; it assumes

that scientific knowledge will be obtained through observation, experimentation and logical reasoning. Elements such as the principle of causality, objectivity, measurability and generalizability constitute the fundamental foundations of this approach. In this framework, reality is a structure that exists in the external world and can be explained independently of the human mind (Bal, 2008).

The positivist paradigm is based on fundamental principles such as objectivity, measurability, and observability in obtaining scientific knowledge. This paradigm argues that reality exists independently of individual perceptions and can be explained by scientific methods. Reality can be expressed through numerical data; therefore, scientific knowledge must be measurable and experimentally testable. According to the principle of universalism, nature and society operate according to universal laws, and these laws are valid always and everywhere. The positivist approach investigates the cause-effect relationships between events and assumes that every event has a reason that can be explained by scientific methods. In this understanding, scientific knowledge should be produced independently of personal values and beliefs (Biçici, 2018).

The scientific method of the positivist paradigm refers to a systematic process of acquiring knowledge. This process begins with objective observations and then continues with the creation of testable hypotheses to explain these observations. Hypotheses are tested through experimental studies and data collection; the obtained data are analyzed and hypotheses are confirmed or refuted. As a result of this verification process, scientific laws and theories are developed (Baykara and Yinal, 2023). However, the positivist paradigm has also been subject to various criticisms. Especially in the field of social sciences, the difficulty of objectively measuring human behavior and social structures reveals the inadequacy of this approach. It is argued that the values and beliefs of scientists can affect the research process, and therefore scientific knowledge cannot be completely unbiased. It has been stated that the process of interpreting scientific data is also open to subjective evaluations. Another criticism is that, given the constantly evolving and changing nature of knowledge, it is not possible to reach absolute truths (Holtz and Odag, 2020).

2.2.2. Interpretative/Positivist Post-Paradigm

The interpretive paradigm offers a more subjective, contextual and multi-faceted perspective to understand human behavior. It is accepted that reality does not consist of a single objective structure; it is shaped according to the experiences, perceptions and meaning-making processes of individuals. This approach, especially in social sciences, focuses on understanding the cultural and social context in which individuals are located. Knowledge production is achieved through techniques such as qualitative research methods, in-depth interviews, observation and content analysis. This paradigm is based on penetrating the world of meaning of individuals and evaluating phenomena within their own context (İbrahimoğlu, 2011).

The interpretive paradigm refers to an approach that argues that social reality is constructed through the subjective experiences, beliefs, and contextual interpretations of individuals. Rather than an objective reality, this paradigm is based on the understanding of multiple realities that individuals and communities create within the framework of their own worlds of meaning. It argues that meaning changes according to context and cannot be fixed universally. Therefore, scientific knowledge is obtained not through direct observation or measurement, but through the interpretation of events, discourses, and actions in individual and cultural contexts. The interpretive paradigm sees the main purpose of scientific research as understanding, not explaining, phenomena, and accepts the influence of the researcher's values and beliefs as an inevitable element in this process (Çarpar, 2020). This approach prefers qualitative research methods in knowledge production. Participant observation allows the researcher to be present in the natural environment of the community and collect data through interaction. Individuals' experiences and perceptions are examined in detail through in-depth interviews. Textual analysis allows layers of meaning to be revealed through the analysis of written or verbal expressions. Case studies, where a specific phenomenon is comprehensively addressed, and ethnographic methods, where cultural structures are examined in depth, are also among the techniques frequently used by this paradigm (Özkan, 2023).

Despite its strengths, the interpretive paradigm also faces some criticisms. One of the most frequently voiced criticisms is that it cannot provide sufficient objectivity because it is based on subjective interpretations, and this weakens scientific reliability. The generalizability of the findings is limited because it is usually studied with small and contextual samples. The possibility that the values of the researcher may affect the research process is also considered one of the weaknesses of this approach. Another criticism is that qualitative research is more open to debate in terms of scientific validity, especially when compared to quantitative research (Emir et al., 2020).

2.3. Contemporary Paradigms for Learning and Teaching

Today, paradigms related to learning and teaching processes have moved beyond classical approaches focused solely on knowledge transfer and have adopted individual-centered, interactive and experience-based approaches. These new paradigms address the cognitive, affective and social dimensions of learning as a whole; they aim to develop students' active participation, critical thinking skills, problem-solving abilities and lifelong learning habits. Constructivist approach, multiple intelligence theory, social learning theory and student-centered teaching models are among the prominent examples of this paradigm shift. In this framework, the teacher is considered in

a guiding position that directs the learning process rather than a knowledge transferor (Charikova and Zhadanov, 2017).

Education is accepted as the basic element of social progress with its function of producing and transferring knowledge and is constantly renewed in parallel with the changes in the social structure. In this context, the concept of value, which shapes the thinking styles, attitudes and behaviors of individuals, gains importance. Values express the basic principles that the individual and society attach importance to, deem correct and necessary, and they can change over time. The transformation in values has brought about paradigm changes, especially in education, and differentiations in the perspective towards knowledge (Öztürk Erzincan, 2012).

In this change experienced in teaching processes, it is observed that the focus has shifted from teaching to learning. The basis of this transformation is social developments such as democratization, sensitivity to human rights, and importance given to individual differences (Overton et al., 2020). Learning processes are now designed according to the interests and abilities of the individual; alternative education models and school types are diversifying, and learning is becoming more individual. In this context, criticisms are voiced that current education programs and measurement-evaluation tools often focus on superficial knowledge and do not sufficiently support thinking. However, thinking is a complex activity that includes deep cognitive processes such as understanding, analyzing, applying, and evaluating information. For this reason, it is emphasized that education programs should be rearranged in a way that develops students' critical, analytical, and creative thinking skills (Şentürk and Baş, 2020). Today's paradigms for learning and teaching reflect the transformations that education has undergone throughout history, and highlight individual-centered, flexible, and interaction-based approaches. These paradigms offer different perspectives on how learning occurs, the function of the teacher, and how learning environments should be structured. The constructivist paradigm argues that individuals actively gain meaning from knowledge through their own experiences; in this context, the teacher is not a transferor of knowledge but a guide who facilitates learning. This approach aims to develop high-level cognitive skills such as problem solving, critical thinking, and collaboration (Mezirow, 1996).

2.4. Related Research

In the study conducted by Aktan (2007), the transformation processes experienced in the field of higher education were examined, new paradigm searches were evaluated and trends that could guide the reforms that need to be carried out in the future were determined. According to the results of the study, it was predicted that the traditional teacher-focused education model in universities would be gradually abandoned and a student-focused and active learning approach would be adopted. It was stated that the traditional roles of the state in higher education would undergo a radical change and its influence on service delivery and financing would gradually decrease.

The study conducted by Wu and He (2009) examines the paradigm trends that are prominent and regressive in the management of public institutions. The researchers collected data on 48 different management courses conducted in China and the United States and examined how the curriculum used in vocational education is affected by changing paradigm understandings. As a result of the study, it was stated that a single paradigm approach is not sufficient; instead, it is stated that evaluating positivist and interpretive paradigms together will produce more effective results in the field of public administration. It was emphasized that the curricula used in vocational education programs should be constantly updated to adapt to changing social, administrative and technological conditions; in this context, it was concluded that a single-dimensional approach cannot fully meet the needs of education.

The study conducted by Green, Noone and Nolan (2013) examines teaching practices in rural areas within the framework of contemporary paradigms and emphasizes the decisive role of the concept of "place" in education. The study reveals that rural teaching is not only a spatial difference but also a multi-layered experience with pedagogical, social and cultural dimensions. According to the results of the study, rural teaching requires establishing strong relationships with local communities, developing context-based teaching strategies and integrating the opportunities offered by place into the education process. The authors argue that traditional approaches to rural teaching are inadequate and that contemporary teacher education programs should provide teacher candidates with place sensitivity and pedagogical approaches specific to rural contexts. In this context, "knowledge of place" has been evaluated as a central element in terms of effective teaching and interaction with the community in rural education.

The study written by Cingel Bodinet (2016) emphasizes that current educational paradigms are inadequate in the face of rapidly changing global conditions and discusses how pedagogical approaches for the future should be shaped. The author states that traditional, static and exam-focused educational models are inadequate in preparing individuals for a world full of uncertainty; instead, he advocates the necessity of transformational and future-focused pedagogies that focus on skills such as flexibility, creativity, critical thinking, collaboration and emotional intelligence. The study also suggests that education should be re-constructed not only as a transfer of knowledge but also as a process that supports the internal development of the individual and social transformation. As a result, Bodinet reveals that a paradigm shift in education is inevitable and that this change is of critical importance for humanity to build a sustainable and meaningful future.

In the study conducted by Overton et al. (2020), five different paradigms that address education in the context of development were examined. These paradigms were classified as education for development, education in development, education against development, education through development, and education where development is redefined, respectively. Each paradigm addresses the role of education from a different perspective and offers unique contributions on the meaning, purpose, and direction of learning at both individual and societal levels. The findings of the study indicate that development policies and education approaches should not only focus on economic growth, but also include broader humanitarian goals such as social justice, cultural diversity, and sensitivity to local contexts. The authors emphasize that the role of education in development is multidimensional and therefore, it is important to evaluate different paradigms together and develop a more inclusive and transformative understanding of education.

3. METHOD

3.1 Research Model

The research is a quantitative study. Quantitative research is a systematic research type conducted based on the collection, analysis and interpretation of numerical data. The aim of such research is to reveal the relationships between variables with statistical methods, to determine patterns and to reach generalizable results (Karasar, 2022). In this context, the relational screening model was used in the research. The relational screening model is a screening model used to determine the level of relationship between multiple variables. Through this model, whether there is a significant relationship between variables, the direction and strength of the relationship are evaluated with statistical methods. This model, which is generally supported by correlation analyses, is aimed at describing the current situation between variables rather than establishing a cause-effect relationship (Büyüköztürk, 2017).

3.2 Universe and Sample

The universe of this research consists of school administrators and teachers in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). In order to increase the representativeness of the participants, the stratified sampling method was preferred. This method is a sampling technique that allows the main mass to be divided into certain subgroups and randomly select individuals from each subgroup in accordance with the ratio of that group in the universe (Büyüköztürk, 2017). The number of participants constituting the sample within the scope of the research is 116. During the sampling process, individuals were divided into strata by considering their educational levels, types of duties and similar decisive characteristics; then, a sample was created by randomly selecting an appropriate number of participants from each stratum.

3.3 Data Collection Tools

The Educational Paradigms Scale developed by Öztürk Erzincan (2012) was used for educational administration paradigms. The scale consists of a total of 70 items, including 5 items on personal information (gender, age, length of service, duty and educational status), 45 items on educational administration paradigms and 35 items on educational paradigms. The items are organized into two options as "a" and "b"; option "a" represents positivist paradigm statements, and option "b" represents interpretivist paradigm statements. The participants were asked to mark both options in order to analyze the opinions in detail. The scale was prepared with a five-point Likert -type rating system. The response options are listed as "Strongly Disagree (1)", "Slightly Agree (2)", "Moderately Agree (3)", "Very Agree (4)" and "Strongly Agree (5)". The lowest score on the scale is 1, and the highest score is 5. For example, a participant who answers "I Totally Agree" to the statement "The manager should maintain the current functioning" receives 5 points, while a participant who answers "I Totally Disagree" receives 1 point. As a result of the reliability analysis of the scale, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated as .9674, which shows that the scale is highly reliable.

3.4 Analysis of Data

The data obtained in the study were analyzed using the SPSS program. First, normality tests were applied to determine whether the data were normally distributed and it was determined that the data were normally distributed. In this direction, parametric tests were used in the analysis process. Independent Sample t-Test was used to compare the means between two groups, and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to evaluate the means of three or more groups. Pearson Correlation Analysis was used to determine the relationship between variables. Since the data showed a normal distribution, these tests were considered appropriate and were preferred to test the hypotheses of the study.

4. FINDINGS

Table 1. Demographic Variables

Category	Variable	n	%
Gender	Woman	65	56.03
	Male	51	43.97
Duty	Executive	30	25.86
	Teacher	86	74.14
Age	20-30	40	34.48
	31-40	35	30.17
	41-50	25	21.55
	51 and over	16	13.79
Professional Seniority	0-5 years	38	32.76
	6-10 years	28	24.14
	11-15 years	22	18.97
	16 years and above	28	24.14
Total		116	100

When the gender distribution of the participants was examined, 56.03% (65 people) were female and 43.97% (51 people) were male. When the distribution of duties was examined, 25.86% (30 people) of the participants were managers and 74.14% (86 people) were teachers. When evaluated in terms of age groups, 34.48% (40 people) were in the 20-30 age range, 30.17% (35 people) were in the 31-40 age range, 21.55% (25 people) were in the 41-50 age range and 13.79% (16 people) were 51 years of age and over. The participants were divided into four groups in terms of professional seniority. While 32.76% (38 people) of the participants had 0-5 years of experience, 24.14% (28 people) had 6-10 years, 18.97% (22 people) had 11-15 years, and again 24.14% (28 people) had 16 years or more of professional experience.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and T-Test Results of Participants' Gender and Adoption of Interpretative Paradigm in Educational Administration Scores

Group	n	Average	Standard Deviation	t Value	p -Value
Woman	65	3.93	0.36	0.22	0.829
Male	51	3.91	0.48		

When the participants' scores for adopting the interpretive paradigm in education management were examined according to their gender, the average score of female participants was calculated as 3.93 and 3.91 for male participants. The standard deviation of females was determined as 0.36 and 0.48 for males. According to the independent sample t-test results, $t(114) = 0.22$, $p = 0.829$, which shows that there is no statistically significant difference. This result reveals that there is no significant difference between female and male participants in terms of their level of adopting the interpretive paradigm in education management.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics and T-Test results of the scores of the participants regarding their duties and their adoption of the interpretive paradigm in educational management.

Group	n	Average	Standard Deviation	F Value	p -Value
Executive	30	3.80	0.50	19.80	0.000
Teacher	86	4.10	0.40		

the scores of the participants regarding the adoption of the interpretive paradigm in educational management were examined according to their duties, the average score of the administrators was determined as 3.80 and the teachers as 4.10. The standard deviation of the administrators was calculated as 0.50 and the teachers as 0.40. According to the independent sample t-test results, $F(1, 114) = 19.80$, $p = 0.000$, which indicates a statistically significant difference. The results reveal that the teachers adopted the interpretive paradigm in educational management at a higher level compared to the administrators.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA-Test Results of Participants' Age and Adoption of Interpretative Paradigm in Educational Administration Scores

Age group	n	Average	Standard Deviation	F Value	p -Value
20-30	40	4.03	0.29	4.40	0.006 1 > 2-3-4
31-40	35	4.00	0.39		
41-50	25	3.76	0.38		
51 and over	16	3.71	0.63		

scores for adopting the interpretive paradigm in educational management were examined according to their age groups , the average score of the participants between the ages of 20-30 was 4.03 , the average score of the participants between the ages of 31-40 was 4.00 , the average score of the participants between the ages of 41-50 was 3.76 , and the average score of the participants aged 51 and over was 3.71 . Standard deviations were calculated as 0.29, 0.39, 0.38, and 0.63 , respectively. The ANOVA test results were $F(3, 112) = 4.40, p = 0.006$, which shows that there is a statistically significant difference . According to the ANOVA test results, the 20-30 age group adopts the interpretive paradigm in educational management at a higher level compared to the other age groups. When post-hoc analyses are performed, it is seen that the 20-30 age group (group 1) has significantly higher scores than the 31-40, 41-50 and 51 and above age groups (groups 2, 3 and 4). This suggests that young individuals adopt a more flexible and interpretive approach in educational management.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA-Test Results of Participants' Scores on Adopting Interpretative Paradigm in Educational Administration with Professional Seniority

Professional Seniority	n	Average	Standard Deviation	F Value	p -Value
0-5 years	38	4.04	0.29	2.84	0.041 4 > 1
6-10 years	28	3.96	0.34		
11-15 years	22	3.92	0.41		
16 years and above	28	3.78	0.44		

When the scores of the participants regarding their adoption of the interpretive paradigm in educational administration were examined according to their professional seniority, the average score of the participants with 0-5 years of seniority was determined as 4.04, the average score of those with 6-10 years of seniority was determined as 3.96, the average score of those with 11-15 years of seniority was determined as 3.92 and the average score of those with 16 years of seniority and above was determined as 3.78 . The standard deviations were calculated as 0.29, 0.34, 0.41 and 0.44, respectively. The ANOVA test results were $F(3, 112) = 2.84, p = 0.041$, indicating that there was a statistically significant difference. Post-hoc analyses showed that those with 16 years of seniority and above (group 4) had significantly lower scores compared to those with 0-5 years of seniority (group 1). These results reveal that there is a tendency to move away from the interpretivist paradigm in educational administration as professional experience increases.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics and T-Test Results of the Positivist Paradigm Adoption Scores in Educational Administration by Participants' Gender

Group	n	Average	Standard Deviation	t Value	p -Value
Woman	65	3.53	0.36	-3.51	0.001
Male	51	3.81	0.48		

When the scores of the participants regarding the adoption of the positivist paradigm in educational management were examined according to their gender, the average score of the female participants was determined as 3.53 and the male participants as 3.81. The standard deviation values were calculated as 0.36 and 0.48, respectively. According to the independent sample t-test results, $t(114) = -3.51, p = 0.001$, indicating a statistically significant difference. This result reveals that the level of adoption of the positivist paradigm in educational management of the male participants was significantly higher than that of the female participants.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics and T-Test results of the scores of the participants regarding their duties and their adoption of the positivist paradigm in educational management.

Group	n	Average	Standard Deviation	t Value	p -Value
Executive	30	3.82	0.36	3.03	0.003
Teacher	86	3.57	0.47		

When the scores of the participants regarding the adoption of the positivist paradigm in educational management were examined according to their duties, the average score of the administrators was determined as 3.82 and that of the teachers as 3.57. The standard deviations were calculated as 0.36 and 0.47, respectively. According to the independent sample t-test results, $t(114) = 3.03$, $p = 0.003$, indicating a statistically significant difference. This result reveals that the administrators adopted the positivist paradigm in educational management at a significantly higher level compared to the teachers.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA-Test Results of Participants' Age and Positivist Paradigm Adoption Scores in Educational Administration

Age group	n	Average	Standard Deviation	F Value	p -Value
20-30	40	3.41	0.38	11.15	0.000 4>1-2-3-4 5 > 2
31-40	35	3.70	0.39		
41-50	25	3.76	0.38		
51 and over	16	4.00	0.32		

When the scores of the participants regarding adoption of the positivist paradigm in educational administration were examined according to their age groups, the average score of the 20-30 age group was determined as 3.41, the average score of the 31-40 age group was determined as 3.70, the average score of the 41-50 age group was determined as 3.76 and the average score of the 51 and over age group was determined as 4.00. Standard deviations were calculated as 0.38, 0.39, 0.38 and 0.32, respectively. The ANOVA test results were $F(3, 112) = 11.15$, $p = 0.000$, indicating that there was a statistically significant difference. Post-hoc analyses show that the 51 and over age group (group 4) had a significantly higher positivist paradigm score compared to the 20-30, 31-40 and 41-50 age groups (groups 1, 2 and 3). A significant difference was found when the 31-40 age group (2nd group) was compared with the 51 and above age group (4th group). These results reveal that as age increases, the tendency towards the positivist paradigm in educational administration increases.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA-Test Results of Participants' Scores on Adopting the Positivist Paradigm in Educational Administration with Professional Seniority

Professional Seniority	n	Average	Standard Deviation	F Value	p -Value
0-5 years	38	3.42	0.38	14.86	0.000 4 > 2-3
6-10 years	28	3.66	0.34		
11-15 years	22	3.93	0.52		
16 years and above	28	3.99	0.27		

When the scores of the participants regarding their adoption of the positivist paradigm in educational administration were examined according to their professional seniority, the average score of those with 0-5 years of seniority was determined as 3.42, the average score of those with 6-10 years of seniority was determined as 3.66, the average score of those with 11-15 years of seniority was determined as 3.93, and the average score of those with 16 years of seniority and above was determined as 3.99. Standard deviations were calculated as 0.38, 0.34, 0.52, and 0.27, respectively. The ANOVA test results were $F(3, 112) = 14.86$, $p = 0.000$, indicating a statistically significant difference. Post-hoc analyses revealed that those with 16 years of seniority and above (group 4) had significantly higher positivist paradigm scores compared to the 2-3 years of seniority groups. These results show that as professional experience increases, the tendency to adopt a positivist paradigm in educational administration becomes stronger.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

According to the findings of this study, the paradigms adopted in educational administration show significant differences according to some demographic characteristics of the participants. No significant difference was found between women and men in terms of the level of adoption of the interpretive paradigm according to the gender variable. However, in the comparison made according to the type of duty, it was revealed that teachers adopted the interpretive paradigm approach at a higher level compared to administrators. When the age variable was

examined, it was seen that the participants in the younger age group adopted the interpretive paradigm more strongly; the level of adoption of this approach decreased as the age increased. A similar trend was observed in terms of professional seniority; it was determined that the tendency towards the interpretive paradigm decreased as the duration of professional experience increased.

When evaluated in terms of the positivist paradigm, it was determined that male participants adopted this approach at a higher level than female participants. It was determined that administrators tended to the positivist paradigm more than teachers. In the examinations made according to age groups, it was seen that the tendency towards the positivist paradigm increased with age; especially the participants in the oldest age group adopted this approach significantly more. Similarly, it was revealed that the tendency towards the positivist paradigm increased significantly as the professional seniority period increased.

These findings show that participants adopt different paradigm understandings in educational administration depending on variables such as age, seniority and duty, and that these differences have the potential to be reflected in managerial practices.

In line with the research findings, the following recommendations can be made:

1. In order to increase the awareness of educational administrators and teachers about different paradigm approaches, in-service training programs should be organized that include contemporary educational management approaches, especially introducing interpretive and critical paradigms.
2. The study found that young teachers adopt the interpretive paradigm more. In order to maintain this positive attitude as professional seniority increases, guidance should be provided for this approach in professional development activities and structured interaction environments should be created with experienced teachers.
3. Considering that administrators tend to lean more towards the positivist paradigm, more emphasis should be placed on content based on the interpretive paradigm in leadership training and administrator education programs in order to adopt more flexible, participatory and human-oriented approaches in school management.
4. In order for teacher candidates to be prepared for the profession with a more critical and flexible perspective, the theoretical and practical course content regarding the educational paradigm should be increased in teacher training programs and students should be introduced to different management approaches.

REFERENCE

- Aktan, C. C. (2007). *Yüksek öğretimde değişim: Global trendler ve yeni paradigmlar*. Yaşar Üniversitesi Yayını.
- Bal, Ö. (2008). Yeni İlköğretim Matematik Öğretim Programının Öğretmen Görüşleri Açısından Değerlendirilmesi. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 17(1), 53-68.
- Baykara, F., & Yinal, A. (2023). Use of Social Media for Promotional Purposes in Tourism: The Example of The Ministry of Tourism and Environment of The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, 13(1), 60.
- Biçici, F. (2016). Kaos Teorisi, Determinizm Ve Yeni Bilim Paradigması Sürecinde Sosyal Bilimler Ve Turizm Araştırmaları Açısından Önemi. *Turizm Akademik Dergisi*, 3(1), 29-38.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2017). *Sosyal Bilimler için Veri Analizi El Kitabı* (23. Baskı). Pegem Akademi.
- Charikova, I., & Zhadanov, V. (2017). Teacher to student epistemological interaction in the contemporary paradigm of university education. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 8(2), 117-129.
- Cingel Bodinet, J. (2016). Pedagogies of the futures: Shifting the educational paradigms. *European Journal of Futures Research*, 4(1), 21.
- Çarpar, M. C. (2020). Sosyolojide İki Niteliksel Desen: Fenomenolojik Ve Etnografik Araştırma. *The journal of social science*, 4(8), 689-704.
- Emir, S., Kıymık, H., & Apalı, A. (2020). Muhasebe Alanında Yürütülen Çalışmaların Nitel İçerik Analizi Tekniğiyle Değerlendirilmesi (2015-2019). *Financial Analysis/Mali Cozum Dergisi*, 30(162).
- Fırat, M. (2006). Pozitivist yaklaşımın eğitim yönetimi alanına yansması, alana getirdiği katkı ve sınırlılıklar.
- Goksoy, S. (2019). Paradigma ve paradigmlar. *Uluslararası Liderlik Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1(1), 1-15.
- Green, N. C., Noone, G., & Nolan, A. (2013). Contemporary paradigms of rural teaching: The significance of place. *Australian and International Journal of Rural Education*, 23(1), 91-115.
- Gülpınar, M. A. (2021). Yeni bir anlam çerçevesi/paradigma arayışı. *Tıp Eğitimi Dünyası*, 20(60), 82-100.
- Güngör, S. (2004). Eğitim yönetiminde paradigmalara ilişkin ilköğretim okul yöneticileri, öğretmenleri ve müfettişlerin görüşleri. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü
- Hammack, P. L. (2005). An integrative paradigm. *Human Development*, 48(5), 267-290.
- Holtz, P., & Odağ, Ö. (2020). Popper was not a positivist: Why critical rationalism could be an epistemology for qualitative as well as quantitative social scientific research. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 17(4), 541-564.
- İbrahimoğlu, Z. (2011). Değişen Paradigmlar Dünyasından Nitel Ve Nicel Araştırmalara Bakmak: Felsefi Yaklaşımlardaki Dönüşümü Anlamak. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(40).

- Kara, P. S. (2022). Ekolojik Düşünceler Ve İslam Dininin Çevreye Bakışının Kesişiminde Sezai Karakoç'un Tabiat Doğa Algısı. *Muhafazakar Düşünce Dergisi*, 18(63), 285-310.
- Karasar, N. (2022). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi* (36. Baskı). Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Kuhn, S. T. (2000). Bilimsel Devrimlerin Yapısı. (5. baskı). (Çev.: N. Kuyuş). İstanbul: Alan Yayınevi.
- Mezirow, J. (1996). Contemporary paradigms of learning. *Adult education quarterly*, 46(3), 158-172.
- Overton, J., Stupples, P., Murray, W. E., Gamlen, A., & Palomino-Schalscha, M. (2020). Learning journeys: Five paradigms of education for development. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 61(2), 366-380.
- Overton, J., Stupples, P., Murray, W. E., Gamlen, A., & Palomino-Schalscha, M. (2020). Learning journeys: Five paradigms of education for development. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 61(2), 366-380.
- Özel, M. (2007). Çağımız Çevre Sorunlarının Düşünsel Temelleri Üzerine Bir Yaklaşım. *Gazi üniversitesi iktisadi ve idari bilimler fakültesi dergisi*, 9(1), 207-226.
- Özkan, U. B. (2023). Doküman inceleme yönteminde geçerlik ve güvenilirlik: eğitim bilimleri araştırmaları bağlamında kuramsal bir inceleme. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (56), 832-848.
- Öztürk Erzincan, Ö. (2012). *Yönetici, öğretmen ve öğretmen adaylarının eğitim yönetimindeki paradigmaları benimseme düzeyleri: İzmir ili örneği* (Yüksek lisans tezi). Ege Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Şentürk, C., & Baş, G. (2020). An overview of learning and teaching from the past to the present: New learning and teaching paradigms in the 21st century. *Paradigm shifts in 21st century teaching and learning*, 1-19.
- Topkaya, E. (2013). Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri güncelleştirilmiş 5. Baskı. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 2(2), 113-118.
- Wu, X., & He, J. (2009). Paradigm shift in public administration: Implications for teaching in professional training programs. *Public Administration Review*, 69(1), 21-28.
- Wu, X., & He, J. (2009). Paradigm shift in public administration: Implications for teaching in professional training programs. *Public Administration Review*, 69(1), 21-28.
- Yıldız, A. (2004). Türkiye'deki yetişkin eğitimi araştırmalarına toplu bakış. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 37(1), 78-96.
- Yinal, A., & Banje, F. U. (2023). Social Media Habits of University Students and the Effects of Media on Students. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 22(3), 88-94.